

**In the Drawings:**

With regard to the objections to the drawings, a replacement drawing of Figure 3 is attached hereto in which the necessary amendment has been entered so that the cross section is now referred to as 5-5.

Copies of the drawings (5 sheets) as originally filed are also enclosed.

**REMARKS:**

As filed the application contained 30 claims of which Claims 1, 15 and 26 were independent claims. The number of claims has now been reduced so that no fees are payable in respect of the total number of claims. However Claims 5, 10, 11, 24 and 25 have been amended so that they are now 8 independent claims. Thus there is now an additional 5 independent claims requiring an additional claims fee of  $(5 \times \$100) = \$500$ .

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee of \$500 to Account No: 01-0310. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

With regard to the objections to the drawings, new drawings are attached hereto in which the necessary amendment on Figure 3 has been entered so that the cross section is now referred to as 5-5. No other drawings are cross sections.

The necessary correction in specification has been entered in the brief description of drawings.

It is believed that the drawings submitted are formal drawings and it is noted that no objection by the draftsman has been attached to the Official Action so that there is no indication of any unacceptable features in the drawings.

Turning now to the claims, minor amendments have been made throughout the claims to provide consistency of language and proper antecedent, even though there is no objection in this regard by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 112. But it is believed that all of the amendments made will be apparent without the necessity for individual comment.

The Examiner has kindly indicated the allowability of certain claims including Claims 5, 10, 11, 24 and 25 and these claims have been amended so that they are now independent claims incorporating all of the features of the original claim from which they depended so that these claims should be in good order for allowance.

It is further noted that the Examiner kindly indicated the allowability of Claim 26 and this claim remains in the application with the minor amendments set forth above entered into this claim also. It is believed therefore that this claim also is in good order for allowance.

The Examiner further kindly indicated the allowability of Claim 19 which depended from Claim 16. Claim 15 has therefore been amended so that it now incorporates the features of Claims 16 and 19 (which are therefore cancelled). It is believed therefore that Claim 15 is also in good order for allowance.

In addition Claim 1 remains in the application and incorporates further features of distinction from the prior art. In particular this claim incorporates the features of distinction as follows:

- a) The peripheral wall of the bowl includes at least one annular recess with an upper side wall and a lower side wall extending outwardly to a base.
- b) There are fluid injection ports in the recess for fluidizing the material therein.

- c) The heavier portion of the slurry collects in the annular recess while the lighter portion and the liquid in the slurry escape over the open mouth.
- d) The accelerator is attached to the bottom of the bowl for common rotation therewith so that the vanes rotate with the bowl to provide acceleration of the slurry.

The Examiner has cited the old patent of Jones. This arrangement provides two elements including a bowl defined by arms 11 and rings 13 and an inner rotor 23. The inner rotor is carried on a hub 24 which is rotatable relative the bowl defined by the arms and the rings.

The Examiner has particularly pointed to the wings 25 and the spaces therebetween together with the top plate above these wings which is at the bottom of a rotor and is not numbered.

However this device operates in an entirely different manner. Firstly it is a device for separating liquid from the particles by a filtering action. Thus heavier materials do not collect in any recess and instead the liquid escapes by a filtering action through slots defined between the individual rings. The particles or heavier materials sit on the inside of the bowl defined by the rings and is carried upwardly of the bowl by the auger flight or helical ring on the outside surface of the rotor. Thus the arrangement operates entirely differently in that the heavier particles are retained within the bowl and carried over the open mouth while the liquid alone escapes through the slots and discharges outwardly.

Thus the arrangement has no annular recess nor any fluid injection ports within that recess. Thus Claim 1 as redefined is distinguished from Jones.

Yet further Claim 1 as amended sets forth that the accelerator is attached to the bottom of the bowl for common rotation therewith. Clearly the element referred to by the Examiner defined by the wings 25 and the unnumbered top plate above those wings is attached to the inner rotor rather than to the bowl. There is no attachment of these elements to the bowl since they must rotate relative to the bowl.

Thus Claim 1 is distinguished from this prior art by the definition now more clearly set forth in Claim 1 that the accelerator is attached to the bottom of the bowl for the common rotation therewith.

Claim 1 as amended is therefore clearly distinguished from the prior art of Jones under 35 U.S.C. 102 and should therefore be allowed.

The arrangement of the present invention ensures that the slurry supplied to the bowl is accelerated to the angular velocity of the bowl by the attachment of the accelerator to the bowl. This is important in an arrangement where the slurry is flowing rapidly and freely over the bowl wall. This is an entirely different construction from that of Jones where the slurry is constrained between the outside of the rotor and the inside of the bowl and thus its freedom to move is severely restricted. There is no suggestion whatsoever that an accelerator of the type shown in Jones should be mounted on the bottom of the bowl and that it should be used in an arrangement in which the bowl is of the construction defined above.

It is submitted therefore that Claim 1 is also distinguished from the prior art and should therefore be allowed.

A new Declaration/Power of Attorney is enclosed herewith as requested by the Examiner.

In view of the foregoing, further and favourable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted

EDWIN JOHN WILLIAM ZONNEVELD ET AL

PER: \_\_\_\_\_

Adrian D. Battison  
Registration No: 31,726

ADB/II

June 16, 2005

Enc.(8)

Adrian D. Battison

Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

Telephone (204) 944-0032 - FAX (204) 942-5723

**CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (703) 872-9306, on June 16, 2005

LYNN LEATHERDALE

Lynn Leatherdale